

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 8, 2005 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The specification, drawing and claims were objected to for various informalities. These have been addressed by the present amendment.

Claim 9 was rejected as being inadequately supported by the present specification. This claim has been cancelled.

Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-19 were rejected as being anticipated by Mitchell. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have previously been amended to recite an activity detector is configured to detect an initiation of a data-transfer operation on a common bus and to provide therefrom *an* enabling signal that is communicated to bus interfaces of a plurality of components coupled to the common bus through respective bus interfaces.

Mitchell is not believed to teach or suggest such a feature. Rather, Mitchell teaches a single component coupled to a bus, the component being partitioned into a first portion that serves as an "activity detector" for that component only. Different enabling signals (not *an* enabling signal) are generated for each component.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: January 3, 2006